

Research Problem Review 76-8

2

LEVEL

AD A 076646

**ASSOCIATE NOMINATIONS IN THE U.S. ARMY  
OFFICER TRAINING ENVIRONMENT:  
THE RANGER COURSE**

DDC FILE COPY



U. S. Army

DDC  
RECEIVED  
NOV 18 1979  
A

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**

Approved for public release  
Distribution Unlimited

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

October 1976

79 11 15 252

# U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the  
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

J. E. UHLANER  
Technical Director

W. C. MAUS  
COL, GS  
Commander

---

## NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-P, 1300 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22209.

FINAL DISPOSITION This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

16 Army Project Number  
20762717A712

Officer Assessment  
and Development

Research Problem Review 76-F

6 ASSOCIATE NOMINATIONS IN THE U.S. ARMY  
OFFICER TRAINING ENVIRONMENT:  
THE RANGER COURSE,

10 R. G. Downey

W. H. Helme, Work Unit Leader

Submitted by:  
Ralph R. Canter, Chief  
Personnel Accession and Utilization Technical Area

11  
October 1976

12 27

14

ARI-RES PROBLEM REV-76-8

Approved by:

E. Ralph Dusek, Director  
Individual Training and Performance  
Research Laboratory

J. E. Uhlaner, Technical Director  
U. S. Army Research Institute for the  
Behavioral and Social Sciences

Research Problem Reviews are special reports to military management. They are usually prepared to meet requirements for research results bearing on specific management problems. A limited distribution is made-- primarily to the operating agencies directly involved.

408 070 xlt

## FOREWORD

The Personnel Accession and Utility Technical Area of the Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences (ARI) conducts research to provide scientific methods of identifying individuals with good leadership potential, selecting officers for commissioning, and evaluating officer performance. One means of prediction and assessing leadership potential is through associate evaluations (peer ratings), which have long been used at the U.S. Military Academy and in Officer Candidate Schools. In 1972, the office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel asked ARI to investigate the value of associate evaluations in all officer schools, beginning with the Ranger course. The present Research Problem Review presents the results of the initial program at the Ranger school during FY 1973, part of a larger program which has since become operational at other officer training schools. Associate evaluation techniques are valuable for feedback and evaluation in officer acquisition and training programs, including ROTC.

The entire project is responsive to special requirements of the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel and to RDTE Project 2Q762717A712.

  
J. E. UHLANER  
Technical Director

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or special
A	

ASSOCIATE NOMINATIONS IN THE U.S. ARMY OFFICER TRAINING ENVIRONMENT:  
THE RANGER COURSE

BRIEF

---

Requirement:

*THIS REPORT EVALUATES*

~~To evaluate~~ the effectiveness of associate ratings in the Ranger training course as an additional measure of career potential and to assess the feasibility of obtaining and using such evaluations in personnel management decisions.

Procedure:

Associate evaluations obtained from all members of three FY 1973 Ranger classes (N = 470) and from 148 additional officers and enlisted personnel attending the Ranger classes were analyzed to yield measures of (1) suitability for use and feasibility of applying the necessary controls within the Ranger training environment, (2) stability over time and personnel shifts, (3) acceptability to Ranger staff and students, and (4) relationship to operational measures of training performance. The associate evaluations used were completed at platoon level.

Findings:

Scores based on the peer evaluations were highly consistent across the three Ranger training phases and changes in composition of the rating groups, indicating that an individual would receive a comparable evaluation under different but similar conditions. The ratings were also in substantial agreement with most course grades in each training phase. Agreement with TAC officer evaluations, an operational measure, was relatively low early in the course but increased as training progressed.

The peer rating procedures operated effectively in the Ranger training environment where length and type of training and personnel interaction patterns are well suited to the method. Students recognized the value of the associate evaluations as a measure of leadership but indicated some resistance to their use in the personnel management system.

Utilization of Findings:

The procedures developed are in operational use at the Ranger and other officer training schools, providing feedback and evaluation information. Similar techniques are being implemented for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC).

ASSOCIATE NOMINATIONS IN THE U.S. ARMY OFFICER TRAINING ENVIRONMENT:  
THE RANGER COURSE

CONTENTS

---

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Objectives	1
Design of the Research	2
PROCEDURES	2
RESULTS	4
CONCLUSIONS	10
Feasibility	10
Reliability	10
Acceptability	10
Relation with Training Outcomes	10
SUMMARY	11
REFERENCES	13
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	15
APPENDIXES	17

TABLES

Table 1. Means and standard deviations for officers and enlisted men on evaluations and Ranger grades	5
2. Reliability of platoon associate evaluations	6
3. Relationship of platoon associate evaluations with Ranger grades and self ratings for officers	7
4. Relationship of platoon associate evaluations with Ranger grades and self ratings for enlisted and allied students	8
5. Percent of officers responding to the Ranger acceptance questionnaire, and relationship of responses with evaluations	9

## ASSOCIATE NOMINATIONS IN THE U.S. ARMY OFFICER TRAINING ENVIRONMENT: THE RANGER COURSE

---

### INTRODUCTION

Improved performance evaluation methods are needed by the Army for personnel management decisions. Evaluation information is vital for decisions such as school selection, assignment, and promotion.

In 1972, the office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel asked the U.S. Army Research Institute to investigate the value of associate evaluations (peer ratings) in all officer schools, beginning with the Ranger course. The present research, part of a larger program designed to introduce associate evaluations into Army officer schools, is in response to that request.

The military has long used associate evaluations (see Selected Bibliography), most notably at the United States Military Academy where the Aptitude for the Service Rating (ASR) is a basic instrument for career evaluation and personnel decisions. Repeated research programs have affirmed the value of the ASR, of which peer ratings are a major component (Haggerty, 1963; Tobin and Macrum, 1967). Second in importance is the use of peer ratings in the Army's Officer Candidate Schools, based on extensive research conducted by the Army Research Institute (Parrish and Drucker, 1957). The success of these programs was a major factor in the decision to investigate the use of associate evaluations in other school environments. The Ranger course was chosen as the first point of study for a variety of reasons. Primary among these were the extensive amount of field time necessary for Ranger training, and the importance of this basic combat training.

Even though associate evaluations had demonstrated positive value in these Army officer training school courses, it was necessary to implement an experimental program at the Ranger School with its unique requirements before these ratings could be approved for operational use. The associate evaluations model developed as part of the present program was also intended for use in additional training courses.

### OBJECTIVES

The present research program was designed to investigate the following characteristics of associate evaluations:

Feasibility--An assessment of (1) suitability of the associate evaluation technique for the particular training environment and (2) the availability of the necessary support materials to insure a proper degree of quality control.

Reliability--A determination of whether the associate evaluation score is a stable estimate of an individual's true score over time, regardless of changes in the rating group.

Acceptability--A evaluation of the Ranger student's acceptance of associate evaluations, and his attitude about potential uses of such evaluations in the Army personnel system.

Relationship with training outcomes--An estimate of the extent to which evaluations are positively correlated with the grades a Ranger receives during training.

## DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH

Data were collected from all members of the first three Ranger classes of FY 1973. A total of 470 officers were administered the associate evaluations. In addition, 86 enlisted personnel and 62 allied students (both officer and enlisted personnel who were not U.S. nationals) attended the training sessions and took part in the evaluation procedures. For purposes of training and evaluation, no distinctions were made among the three groups.

Each Ranger course is approximately eight weeks long and is divided into three approximately equal phases. The first phase routinely consists of daytime training and field exercises at Fort Benning, Georgia. The next two phases observed were conducted, respectively, at a mountain camp in Georgia and a swamp area at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida. The two latter phases principally consisted of field exercises extending through the night. During training, most activities were conducted either in the platoon or squads. Squad size was 12-16 individuals with four squads in each platoon, and four platoons in each class. There was also a heavy dependence on the buddy system. Rangers were in close and continuous contact with each other for most of the training period.

## PROCEDURES

For research purposes, associate evaluations were done within the platoon, although current Ranger operational procedures also called for the use of associate evaluations within the squad. The platoon evaluations called for each member of the group to nominate the eight highest and eight lowest members of the platoon in terms of the "...individual that in your judgement you would most (least) like to serve with in combat because of his potential for effective leadership." Materials used for the nominations were the Manual for Administration of Ranger Course Associate Ratings, PT 4884; the U.S. Army Standard Rating Form, PT 4839 (Appendix A); and the Guide for Coding the U.S. Army Standard Rating Form (PT 4839), PT 4885 (Appendix B). The operational, squad level Ranger Evaluation Report is given for comparison in Appendix C. Although the long-range research plans for ARI associate evaluations call for changing the composition of the evaluating groups, in the present case,



the Rangers wished to retain their peer ratings system until the research was completed. Both the Ranger staff and the research team agreed that ample opportunity for interactions existed at platoon level and that platoon-level evaluations could therefore be expected to be valid and reliable. Nonetheless, data from both associate evaluations systems were obtained and compared.

Other experiences with associate evaluations have revealed problems with preparing, scoring, and reporting. These have been major factors in decisions to maintain existing systems. A previous research project, on a peer rating machine (Medland and Olans, 1964), helped to solve these problems, as have rapid data-processing machines now available at most training sites. Data-processing procedures developed in the present project were designed to meet two needs: to insure the highest degree of accuracy and to reduce the administrative load on unit personnel. The final data-processing procedures used (1) available machine-processable records at the school site (2) an optical scanning sheet format, and (3) a computer to score and report results (described in ARI's "Manual for the Preparation, Scoring, and Utilization of OBC Associate Ratings, PT 4950").

In essence, each platoon member listed, in order, the 8 individuals he would most like to serve with in combat and the 8 he would least like to serve with. The final associate evaluation score was the average weighted number of nominations an individual in a platoon received. A high nomination received a score of 7, a low nomination a score of 1, and a "No nomination" (that is, an officer was not named in a given evaluation sheet) a score of 4. For example, in a platoon of 41 members, an officer who received 25 high nominations, 12 "no nominations", and 3 low nominations would have a final score of 5.65, computed thus:

$$\frac{25 \times 7 + 12 \times 4 + 3 \times 1}{40} = 5.65,$$

the 40 being the number of individuals making the evaluations (the platoon minus the person being scored). An officer receiving no nomination on any evaluation sheet would have a score of 4. This practice insured that each individual received an evaluation score. The evaluation procedure was repeated at the end of each of the training phases (Benning, mountain, and Florida), yielding three evaluation scores for each individual.

To assess the acceptability of the evaluation procedures, the Associate Rating questionnaire was developed. Appendix D contains a copy of this questionnaire which elicits attitudes on a variety of factors. Information for this part of the study was collected from each of the Rangers at the end of the final phase of training.

The reliability of the evaluations was studied by two methods. A split-half (or group) technique used the relationship between two random halves of the platoon as an indication of the stability of evaluations across different groups of evaluators. A test-retest method, which indicates the degree of relationship between evaluations during different training phases, reflected the stability of the evaluations.

A variety of evaluation information is collected during Ranger course training (McClusky and McPherson, 1970). Each man received nine training grades during this project, three Ranger squad-level associate evaluations and a final course grade. These evaluations are listed in Table 1. The degree to which the platoon associate evaluations relate to other course evaluations served as a preliminary indicator of the value of associate evaluations.

## RESULTS

The administrative and data processing procedures were found to operate effectively under a variety of circumstances and have continued in operation for several years. The use of school records and a machine-processable optical scanning sheet effectively reduced the number of personnel necessary to conduct the program and lessened the chance of errors. There were some initial problems of an administrative and technical nature (i.e., different computer languages, different machine capabilities), but they were solved. The procedures used here became the evaluation system prototype for all branch officer courses.

The reliability of evaluations across all phases of training was found to be very high, using both the split-half and the test-retest methods. Split-half reliability coefficients from all three classes are presented in Table 2. These values indicate that a given individual would receive a comparable evaluation score in a different but similar group and environment.

Table 2 also presents the test-retest reliability coefficients for all officers and enlisted personnel. Again, the correlations indicate a high level of agreement, even when individuals switched platoons (rating groups) after each phase of training.

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations for platoon associate evaluations, and Ranger grades for the officer and enlisted samples. The scores in most cases are quite similar, with officers generally showing slightly higher means. The final class grade reflects this overall effect. Also, means and standard deviations for platoon associate evaluations were similar for officer and enlisted samples across all phases of training.

Table 3 shows the correlations between the platoon associate evaluations in each of the three training phases and the Ranger grades and self-ratings. The land navigation test, the practical work exam, and special report scores were not related to the platoon associate evaluations. However, several interesting relations were found. Physical training grades had a low but significant positive correlation with platoon evaluations for the Benning and Mountain phases, but not for the Florida phase. TAC officer evaluations tended to have a low but significant

Table 1

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR OFFICERS AND ENLISTED  
MEN ON EVALUATIONS AND RANGER GRADES

Variable		Mean		Standard Deviation	
		Officer N = 470	Enlisted N = 86	Officer N = 470	Enlisted N = 86
Platoon associate evaluations	B	2.07	1.99	.29	.37
Platoon associate evaluations	M	2.05	1.96	.30	.37
Platoon associate evaluations	F	2.04	1.99	.34	.36
Land Navigation--total score		51.37	51.26	10.67	9.87
Physical training score		26.64	25.35	6.71	8.06
Practical work exam		86.61	78.00	4.41	8.41
Patrol grades		355.10	354.53	32.01	29.72
TAC rating	B	21.98	20.04	3.61	4.54
TAC rating	M	25.51	23.74	3.76	5.78
TAC rating	F	27.04	27.93	2.67	2.65
Squad associate evaluations	B	37.84	35.79	4.87	5.87
Squad associate evaluations	M	57.27	54.36	7.71	9.55
Squad associate evaluations	F	55.57	54.07	6.53	6.60
Spot reports		-6.40	-12.44	21.89	21.72
Special observations		-6.77	-6.34	16.16	20.86
Final class grade <sup>a</sup>		724.56	691.49	94.12	120.92

<sup>a</sup>Includes failures and turnbacks to next class.

Table 2

## RELIABILITY OF PLATOON ASSOCIATE EVALUATIONS

Evaluation Phase	(B)	(M)	(F)
Benning (B)	(.93)	.78	.73
Mountain (M)		(.91)	.79
Florida (F)			(.97)

Note. Correlations in parentheses are the average from the corrected split-halves for the three classes. The off-diagonal correlations are for all officers and enlisted personnel, N = 556, and are a test-retest estimate.

relation with the platoon evaluations; however, TAC ratings and platoon evaluations for the same phase tended to be more highly correlated as training progressed. Squad evaluations showed a high correlation with platoon evaluations, particularly in the same phase of training. Correlations between platoon evaluations and Total Ranger Performance (which includes squad ratings) became greater with time. Finally, platoon evaluations and self-evaluations were significantly related, indicating that both the individual's estimate of himself and his estimate of the platoon's evaluation were in some agreement with the platoon evaluations.

Comparable data for enlisted and allied students are presented in Table 4. Enlisted personnel tended to show higher correlation between associate evaluations and other measures than did either officer or allied personnel.

Table 5 summarizes officer responses to items from the Ranger acceptance questionnaire (Appendix D). Ranger students substantially accepted the platoon associate evaluation system (items 1-4c and 5f, Table 5). Correlations between the platoon evaluations and questionnaire items indicated that high peer evaluation scores were associated with greater acceptance. But even though the evaluations were considered valuable and predictive by the students, substantial resistance to their use in the personnel system was noted (items 7a-7d, 8, and 9a-9e, Table 5).

Table 3

RELATIONSHIP OF PLATOON ASSOCIATE EVALUATIONS WITH  
RANGER GRADES AND SELF RATINGS FOR OFFICERS  
(N= 470)

Other Evaluations	Platoon Associate Evaluations		
	Benning	Mountain	Florida
Land Navigation--Total	-.00	-.00	.06
Physical Training	.13**	.12**	.00
Practical Work Exam	-.01	.03	.06
Patrol Grades	.09*	.12**	.26**
TAC--Benning	.17**	.19**	.15**
TAC--Mountain	.22**	.29**	.27**
TAC--Florida	.34**	.36**	.43**
Squad Ratings--Benning	.78**	.62**	.55**
Squad Ratings--Mountain	.58**	.69**	.57**
Squad Ratings--Florida	.56**	.56**	.67**
Spot Reports	.14**	.17**	.23**
Special Reports	.05	.10*	.05
Total Ranger Performance	.27**	.30**	.52**
Self/Should <sup>a</sup>	.41**	.37**	.38**
Self/Do <sup>b</sup>	.49**	.51**	.55**

Note. A t test was used for testing for r's significantly different from zero.

a - Self/Should ratings reflect an individual's estimate of where he should rate.

b - Self/Do ratings are the individual's estimate of where the group will rate him.

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .01$

Table 4

RELATIONSHIP OF PLATOON ASSOCIATE EVALUATIONS WITH RANGER GRADES  
AND SELF RATINGS FOR ENLISTED AND ALLIED STUDENTS

Other Evaluations	Platoon Associate Evaluations					
	Enlisted (N = 86)			Allied (N = 62)		
	Benning	Mt.	Fla.	Benning	Mt.	Fla.
Land Navigation--Total	.19	.23*	.12	.08	.22	.08
Physical Training	.10	.08	-.12	-.08	-.10	-.11
Practical Work Exam	.31**	.19	.11	.13	.27*	.29*
Patrol Grades	.47**	.44**	.46**	.00	.41**	.33**
TAC--Benning	.41**	.30**	.06	-.33**	-.21	-.14
TAC--Mountain	.54**	.64**	.40**	-.02	.29*	.21
TAC--Florida	.25*	.42**	.43**	.25*	.18	.33**
Squad Ratings--Benning	.86**	.72**	.65**	.77*	.48*	.52*
Squad Ratings--Mountain	.64**	.74**	.67**	.54*	.71*	.76*
Squad Ratings--Florida	.39**	.53**	.63**	.57**	.63**	.87**
Spot Reports	.28**	.35**	.10	-.32**	-.00	.10
Special Reports	.32**	.44**	.40**	-.23	-.22	-.16
Total Ranger Performance	.46**	.61**	.67**	.07	.44**	.45**
Self/Should <sup>a</sup>	.40**	.40**	.43**	.18	.33**	.23
Self/Do <sup>b</sup>	.45**	.46**	.48**	.11	.45**	.20

Note. A t test was used for testing for r's significantly different from zero.

a - Self/Should ratings reflect where an individual thinks he should rate.

b - Self/Do ratings are the individual's estimate of where the group will rate him.

\* -  $p < .05$

\*\* -  $p < .01$

Table 5

PERCENT OF OFFICERS RESPONDING TO THE RANGER ACCEPTANCE QUESTIONNAIRE,  
AND RELATIONSHIP OF RESPONSES WITH EVALUATIONS

Item No.	Question	Response Options <sup>a</sup>					$\bar{r}$ with platoon rating
		1	2	3	4	5	
1	Ratings valuable predictors	3.9	49.9	25.7	15.7	1.8	.09**
2	Length of time adequate	7.8	50.7	11.2	25.5	4.9	.27**
3	Situations adequate	9.9	56.6	17.7	12.7	3.1	.25**
4a	Can predict performance in school	65.5	34.5				.16**
4b	Can predict performance in combat	75.1	24.9				.15**
4c	Can predict performance in staff	70.1	29.9				.14**
5a	Performance--land navigation	76.5	23.5				.09
5b	Performance--Physical training	87.0	13.0				.10
5c	Performance--Practical work exam	61.9	38.1				.03
5d	Performance--Patrol grades	72.1	27.9				.12*
5e	Performance--TAC rating	21.6	78.4				-.05
5f	Performance--Ranger ratings	62.2	37.8				.18**
5g	Performance--Spot reports	27.1	72.9				.09
5h	Performance--Special Reports	52.1	47.9				.04
6	Feedback changes behavior	2.6	20.8	39.6	25.5	11.5	.00
7a	DA record--school selection	4.7	35.8	15.1	24.9	19.5	.22**
7b	DA record--duty assignment	1.8	28.8	17.4	29.6	22.3	.21**
7c	DA record--promotion	3.1	27.3	17.1	27.3	25.2	.18**
7d	DA record--Total record	6.0	30.0	20.9	20.4	22.7	.20**
8	Time record kept for DA	50.1	6.7	4.3	25.6	13.2	-.19**
9a	Use ratings in individual train.	56.8	43.2				.16*
9b	Use ratings in Basic course	56.6	43.4				.10*
9c	Use ratings in Advanced course	56.9	43.1				.09
9d	Use ratings in C&GSC	51.9	48.1				.09
9e	Use ratings in SSC	58.4	41.6				.10*
10	Help self development	23.9	49.3	26.8			.10*

Note.  $\bar{r}$  = correlation of the Florida platoon ratings and the item. The sign of the correlation has been reversed. A  $t$  test was used for testing for  $\bar{r}$ 's significantly different from zero.

<sup>a</sup> See Appendix E:

Items 1-3 6, 7: 1 = Completely agree, 2 = Mostly agree, 3 = Undecided,  
4 = Mostly disagree, 5 = Completely disagree

Items 4, 5 9: 1 = Yes, 2 = No

Item 8: 1 = Do NOT want on record, 2 = Until next assignment, 3 = Until promotion,  
4 = Indefinitely with decreasing weight, 5 = Until next rating

Item 10: 1 = Yes, 2 = ?, 3 = No

\*  $p < .05$

\*\*  $p < .01$

## CONCLUSIONS

### FEASIBILITY

The Ranger environment was found to be especially suitable for the associate evaluation technique. The type, duration, length, and social interaction patterns of the training program provided both the necessary basic information and the appropriate attitudinal setting for conducting evaluations. Command support for associate evaluations was considered excellent and became an integral part of the program. The inclusion of all raters, both officers and enlisted, in the evaluations did not appear to be a barrier in any measurable way, even though prior concern had been expressed about this aspect of the procedures.

After some initial logistical problems had been solved, the procedures for producing and scoring the associate evaluations were easily maintained. Nominal personnel resources were found sufficient to insure the proper level of quality control of the scores.

### RELIABILITY

The reliability index reflecting the consistency of evaluation scores for different people indicated that any individual Ranger would receive a similar score if he were in a different platoon.

The reliability index reflecting the stability of evaluation scores over time (in different phases of training, different time periods, and, to some degree, with different people) indicated that an individual Ranger would receive reasonably consistent scores throughout his training; these scores have stability, but to a lesser degree.

The relation between the experimental platoon evaluations and the operational Ranger squad ratings indicated a fairly substantial degree of agreement. The platoon evaluations tended to be somewhat more stable indicators.

### ACCEPTABILITY

Responses to the acceptability questionnaire indicated that the Rangers felt associate evaluations were appropriate and valid indicators of leadership but felt slightly negative about their use in a Department of the Army personnel system. This result seems indicative not of distrust in the ability of the evaluations to provide personnel managers with useful information, but rather of a general anxiety about being evaluated.

### RELATION WITH TRAINING OUTCOMES

Associate evaluations displayed a moderate to low degree of correlation with other training evaluations, primarily patrol grades,



TAC evaluations, and spot reports. The evaluations would seem to provide an additional source of information.

Although some differences were found between the officer and enlisted samples, the overall pattern was very similar.

#### SUMMARY

The use of associate evaluations in the Ranger Course was found to be feasible, and the ratings reliable. When compared with training grades, the evaluations were shown to yield valid estimates. In addition, students recognized their strong potential value as a measure of leadership, even though there was some resistance to their use in the personnel management system. Research is under way to secure an on-the-job performance evaluation of the Rangers studied. Such evaluations should determine the predictive validity of associate evaluations.

The associate evaluation procedures and systems developed at the Ranger school and described in the present report have been used in the development of other evaluative research programs for officer schools.

## REFERENCES

---

- Haggerty, Helen R. Status report on research for the U. S. Military Academy. ARI Technical Research Report 1133. October 1963.
- McClusky, M. R., and McPherson, J. H. An analysis of the Ranger department student evaluation system. Alexandria, Va.: Human Resources Research Organization consulting report. June 1970.
- Medland, F. F., and Olans, J. L. Automated procedures for obtaining and scoring peer ratings. ARI Research Study 64-2. August 1964.
- Parrish, J. A., and Drucker, A. J. Personnel research for Officer Candidate School. ARI Technical Research Report 1107. November 1957. (AD 15 507)
- Tobin, D. J., and Macrum, R. H. Leadership Evaluations. West Point, N.Y.: U. S. Army Military Academy, Office of Military Psychology and Leadership research report. 1967.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

deJung, J. E., and Kaplan, H. Some differential effects of race of rater and ratee on early peer ratings of combat aptitude. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1962, 46, 370-374.

Downey, R. G. Associate ratings and senior service school selection. ARI Research Memorandum 73-4. December 1973.

Downey, R. G. Associate evaluations: Nominations vs. ratings. ARI Technical Paper 253. September 1974.

Downey, R. G. Associate evaluations: Improving field acceptance. ARI Research Memorandum 75-5. July 1975.

Downey, R. G., and Duffy, P. J. Review of peer evaluation research. ARI Technical Paper, in press.

Downey, R. G., Medland, F. F. and Yates, L. G. Evaluation of a peer rating system for predicting subsequent promotion of senior military officers. ARI Research Memorandum 76-7, April 1976. (Also published in Journal of Applied Psychology, 1976, 61(2), 206-209.)

Gordon, L. V. Estimating the reliability of peer ratings. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1969, 29, 305-313.

Hammer, C. H. A simplified technique for evaluating basic trainees on leadership potential. ARI Research Memorandum 63-10. October 1963.

Klieger, W. A., deJung, J. E., and Dubuisson, A. U. Peer ratings as predictors of disciplinary problems. ARI Technical Research Note 124. July 1962. (AD 295 183)

Medland, F. F. Research to identify potential NCO leaders. ARI Research Study 64-1. May 1964.

Medland, F. F., and Olans, J. L. Peer rating stability in changing groups. ARI Technical Research Note 142. April 1964.

Medland, F. F., Yates, L. G., and Downey, R. G. Associate ratings of senior officer potential. ARI Research Problem Review 74-2. June 1974.

Wherry, R. J., and Fryer, D. H. Buddy ratings: Popularity contest or leadership criteria? Personnel Psychology, 1949, 2, 147-159.

Williams, S. B., and Leavitt, H. J. Group opinion as a predictor of military leadership. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1947, 11, 283-291.

## APPENDIXES

---

Appendix	Page
A. U.S. Army Standard Rating Form	19
B. Guide for Coding the U.S. Army Standard Rating Form (PT 4839)	21
C. Ranger Evaluation Report	23
D. Ranger Course Associate Rating Program	25

SPECIAL CODES		DO NOT MAKE ANY ENTRIES ON THIS FORM UNTIL YOU COMPLETELY UNDERSTAND THE INSTRUCTIONS. Use a #2 pencil for all entries. Avoid making any stray pencil marks on the form, and be sure that all erasures are complete and clean.		Social Security Number	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
29					
30					
31					
32					
33					
34					
35					
36					
37					
38					
39					
40					
41					
42					
43					
44					
45					
46					
47					
48					
49					

PT - 4839 FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY (When Completed)

U.S. ARMY STANDARD RATING FORM

# APPENDIX B

## GUIDE FOR CODING THE U. S. ARMY STANDARD RATING FORM (PT - 4839)

### CODING IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

Read all the instructions on this page and study the example. Be sure that you understand the instructions thoroughly before completing the Social Security Number (SSN) block on your answer sheet.

- ① First, in the boxes at the top enter the digits of your Social Security Number. Omit hyphens and record only the nine digits of the Number.
- ② Next, after entering the digits of your Social Security Number in the boxes at the top, code each digit, including zeroes, by making a single heavy mark in the appropriate number space for each column, as shown in the example below.

EXAMPLE: SSN: 515404953

Social Security Number								
5	1	5	4	0	4	9	5	3
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

### CODING RATING INFORMATION

To Code MOST

Identify the individual you want to code as MOST

Then, find his name on the roster and code the "H" block in the "Rating" column to the right of his name.

Sample

NAME	1	RATING
1 BAELOCK, JAMES	Y	1 2 3 4 5 6 H

FILL IN THIS ENTIRE BLOCK

To Code LEAST

Identify the individual you want to code as LEAST

Then find his name on the roster and code the "L" block in the "Rating" column to the right of his name.

Sample

NAME	1	RATING
2 MARCUM, ROBERT	Y	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 L

FILL IN THIS ENTIRE BLOCK

**MAKE NO MARKS ON THIS SHEET**

PT 4885

- 21

PRECEDING PAGE NOT FILMED  
BLANK

APPENDIX C

RANGER EVALUATION REPORT

Instructions:

1. Evaluate each man in your squad in comparison with a 40-man Ranger group. Consider the characteristics below prior to determining the man's rating. You must rate every student assigned to your squad. Do not rate yourself.
2. No more than two squad members may be placed in the 1-10 column. No two men will be assigned the same numerical rating.
3. Under REMARKS, write a 2-3 sentence word picture to justify the numerical rating you assigned. State briefly the characteristics (desirable or undesirable) of this man that impressed you most.

EVALUATED STUDENT'S NAME (Last, first)		DATE  DAY    MONTH    YEAR /       /	
RANGER CHARACTERISTICS			
TACTICAL KNOWLEDGE	GOOD SOLDIERLY HABITS	CONFIDENCE	
PHYSICAL STAMINA	SELF-DISCIPLINE	ENTHUSIASM	
TIMELINESS OF ACTION	DRIVE	INITIATIVE	
ATTENTION TO DETAIL	TEAMWORK	DEPENDABILITY	
PHASE OF TRAINING (Circle one)	BENNING	MOUNTAINS	FLORIDA
STANDING WITHIN A 40-MAN GROUP (Circle one)			
REMARKS:		1	11
		2	12
		3	13
		4	14
		5	15
		6	16
		7	17
		8	18
		9	19
		10	20
		21	31
		22	32
		23	33
		24	34
		25	35
		26	36
		27	37
		28	38
		29	39
		30	40
SIGNATURE:		GRADE:	
		SERIAL NUMBER:	

FB (RD) Form 2  
14 JUN 68 Previous editions are obsolete

APPENDIX D

RANGER COURSE  
Associate Rating Program

I. Instructions

The Army is expanding the sources and kinds of information on the performance and potential of personnel in order to improve the effectiveness of personnel management actions. One of these sources of information is the associates ratings of potential such as those that you have completed in the Ranger Course.

Based on your experiences in observing and evaluating the relative performance of the fellow-members of your platoon during this training period, your reactions and opinions concerning the utility and acceptability of these associate ratings is requested.

THIS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY AND WILL NOT BE MADE AVAILABLE TO RANGER DEPARTMENT ALTHOUGH SUMMARY STATISTICS WILL BE COMPILED.

Answer each of the following questions fully and frankly. If you wish to comment about any question, write the question number and your comments on the back of the page (answer sheet), or if you wish to make general comments about the rating program, enter these comments on the back of the page also.

MAKE ALL MARKS ON THESE SHEETS

Example:

YES

☒

?

☐

NO

☐



Before beginning the questionnaire print your name, SSN, and class number.

NAME (LAST, FIRST, MI) \_\_\_\_\_ SSN \_\_\_\_\_ Class number \_\_\_\_\_

1. To what extent do you agree that associate ratings are valuable in predicting future performance?

12 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐  
Completely Mostly Undecided Mostly Completely  
agree agree disagree disagree disagree

2. To what extent do you agree that the length of time spent with members of your platoon was adequate to make sound judgments about their expected performance in future operational situations?

13 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐  
Completely Mostly Undecided Mostly Completely  
agree agree disagree disagree disagree

3. To what extent do you agree that the situations, upon which your observations and judgments were based, were adequate for making sound evaluations of the members of your platoon?

14 ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐  
Completely Mostly Undecided Mostly Completely  
agree agree disagree disagree disagree

4. Check YES for each of the following future situations for which associate rating have value in predicting good performance. Then rank them from Highest (1) to Lowest (3) in terms of their value.

	Have Value		Rank (1-3)
	Yes	No	
15-16 a. Other schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17-18 b. Combat situations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19-20 c. Staff positions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. From the following list of Ranger Grades select those which you would consider to be good evaluations of potential combat performance. Then rank them from Best (1) to worst (8).

		Good		Rank
		Yes (1)	No (2)	(1-8)
<input type="checkbox"/> 21-22	a. Land Navigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> 23-24	b. Physical Training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> 25-26	c. Practical Work Exam	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> 27-28	d. Patrol Grades	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> 29-30	e. Tactical Officers Grades	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> 31-32	f. Ranger Evaluation Reports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> 33-34	g. Spot Reports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> 34-36	h. Special Observation Reports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. To what extent do you agree that the information provided to you by the Ranger Reports helped you to change and improve your behavior?

<input type="checkbox"/> 37	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Completely agree	Mostly agree	Undecided	Mostly disagree	Completely disagree

7. To what extent do you agree that the associate rating should become part of the record along with other evaluations, OER, EER, Academic Records etc? MAKE A judgment for each of the following situations:

		Completely Agree (1)	Mostly Agree (2)	Undecided (3)	Mostly disagree (4)	Completely disagree (5)
<input type="checkbox"/> 38	a. Selection for schools and other training	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> 39	b. Duty assignment by OPO	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> 40	c. Promotion Decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> 41	d. PART OF TOTAL RECORD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. If you are willing to have the rating score made a part of the record, how long do you favor its use (check only one)?

- 42
- (1) ☐ DO NOT want on Record
- (2) ☐ Next Assignment only
- (3) ☐ Until promoted to next grade
- (4) ☐ Indefinitely, but given decreasing weight as later evaluations are collected
- (5) ☐ Until replaced by ratings in a subsequent school/training situation

9. In which of the following schools should associate rating be given (check Yes or No for each)?

- |    | Yes<br>(1)               | No<br>(2)                |                                    |
|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 43 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Individual training programs       |
| 44 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Basic Schools                      |
| 45 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Advanced Schools                   |
| 46 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Command & General Staff College    |
| 47 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | NCO Academy/Senior Service College |

10. Do you find that knowing your rating score has helped you in your counselling, self-evaluation and career planning?

- 48
- YES ☐ (1)      ? ☐ (2)      NO ☐ (3)

11. Comparing your performance with that of the other members of your platoon, where would you rate your own standing?

- 49
- | Upper<br>1/5             | Next<br>1/5              | Mid<br>1/5               | Lower<br>1/5             | Lowest<br>1/5            |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (1)                      | (2)                      | (3)                      | (4)                      | (5)                      |

12. Where do you feel that your final score actually falls

- 50
- | Upper<br>1/5             | Next<br>1/5              | Mid<br>1/5               | Lower<br>1/5             | Lowest<br>1/5            |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (1)                      | (2)                      | (3)                      | (4)                      | (5)                      |